
The Morgan Manuscript of Phaedrus

Author(s): Chauncey E. Finch

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1971), pp. 301-307

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](http://www.jhu.edu/)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/293340>

Accessed: 17/09/2011 09:32

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

THE MORGAN MANUSCRIPT OF PHAEDRUS.

Of the small number of extant manuscripts of Phaedrus the most important by far is unquestionably the ninth-century Codex Pithoeanus (= P), so called by earlier scholars because it once belonged to Pierre Pithou and was utilized by him in the preparation of the *editio princeps* published in 1596.¹ In the years which followed this manuscript remained until very recent times in the possession of descendants of Pithou. In 1893 an elaborate palaeographical edition of P was published by Ulysse Robert with permission of the current owner,² but after that time scholars were consistently denied access to the document by the other descendants of Pithou who became its successive owners. Hence all twentieth-century editors of Phaedrus have been compelled to rely almost exclusively on information about the manuscript provided by Robert, with the result that a considerable amount of opprobrium has been heaped upon the head of the Marquis L. de Rosanbo by several of the editors, especially by J. P. Postgate, who charges him with guarding the manuscript with the same type of zeal employed by the dragon in Phaedrus IV, 20.³ Most recent editors have granted that Robert's *édition paléographique* appears to be accurate, but it is clear from their cautious statements that a lingering doubt remains in the minds of some of them.

This doubt can now be dispelled. Codex Pithoeanus has recently become the property of The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York City, where it is catalogued as M. 906. With the aid of a microfilm of the manuscript kindly made available to me by the Photographic Department of The Pierpont Morgan Library I have made a careful comparison of the text of this document with Robert's palaeographical edition and can confirm

¹ For a discussion of the other manuscripts of Phaedrus see Ben Edwin Perry, *Babrius and Phaedrus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), pp. xcvi-c.

² Ulysse Robert, *Les fables de Phèdre, Édition paléographique publiée d'après le manuscrit Rosanbo* (Paris, 1893).

³ Iohannes Percival Postgate, *Phaedri Fabulae Aesopiae cum Nicolai Perotti Prologo et Decem Novis Fabulis* (Oxford, 1919), p. iii.

that this editor maintained an extraordinarily high level of accuracy in the production of his study.⁴ There are a few minor errors, but only one of these, as will be noted below, requires any change in the *textus receptus*.

As indicated by Robert, P is a parchment manuscript made up of 55 folios which measure 195 mm. by 155 mm. The first 39 folios contain the Fables of Phaedrus and the remaining 16, a work entitled *De monstribus, belluis, et serpentibus liber*. Prefixed to these is a paper copy of the Fables of Phaedrus prepared by Pithou from the parchment copy for his edition of this work.⁵ At the time Robert prepared his edition there was no numbering on the leaves of the paper copy by Pithou, but the Phaedrus portion of the parchment manuscript was numbered by pages rather than by folios, being comprised of pages 1-77 (with page 39 repeated). The first three pages of *De monstribus, belluis, et serpentibus liber* were numbered 78-80, but the remaining pages had been left unnumbered. Before this time, however, as indicated by Robert in his table on page xi, a group of seven folios had fallen out of their original position after what was formerly designated page 47, and had been bound into another part of the document. This displacement of folios still exists, but a new system of numbering has been introduced since Robert studied the manuscript. The new system is the more conventional numbering of the document throughout by folios rather than by pages. According to the new plan the Pithou copy of Phaedrus occupies ff. 1-32, the ninth-century Phaedrus occupies ff. 33-71 (but in the order 33-56, 64-71, 57-63), and *De monstribus, belluis, et serpentibus liber*, ff. 72-87.

Robert is certainly correct in his assertion that both the Phaedrus portion of P and the *De monstribus, belluis, et serpentibus liber* were copied by the same hand.⁶ He is also correct in designating this as a Carolingian hand of the early part of the ninth century.⁷ An important body of evidence, however, which

⁴ I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Photographic Department of The Pierpont Morgan Library for providing me with a microfilm of the Phaedrus manuscript and to the Trustees of the same institution for granting me permission to publish the readings of the manuscript cited in this paper.

⁵ Robert, *op. cit.*, pp. x-xi.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xli.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. xiii.

may be used for indicating the date of the manuscript with much greater precision, is overlooked by him. Although he notes that *t* surmounted with a 2-shaped symbol is used once in Phaedrus for *-tur*,⁸ he fails to mention that both this sign and *t* surmounted with an apostrophe are used for *-tur* many times, often on the same page, in *De monstribus, belluis, et serpentibus liber*. For example, *t* with an apostrophe is used once on f. 74^v, once on f. 76^r, once on f. 76^v, once on f. 77^r, once on f. 78^r, once on f. 78^v, once on f. 79^r, once on f. 80^r, once on f. 80^v, twice on f. 81^r, twice on f. 83^r, twice on f. 83^v, once on f. 85^r, and three times on f. 85^v; *t* with the 2-shaped symbol is used three times on f. 76^r, once on f. 77^r, twice on f. 77^v, three times on f. 78^v, twice on f. 79^r (including one instance in a marginal gloss probably by the first hand), once on f. 79^v, twice on f. 80^r, once on f. 80^v, once on f. 83^r, once on f. 83^v, once on f. 84^r, once on f. 85^r, and once on f. 87^r. Such use of both symbols for *-tur* in the same manuscript indicates that the text was copied around the year A. D. 820.⁹ The script employed in P is in many respects quite similar to that found in Bibl. mun. 1, Épernay, as can be seen from a comparison of either of the two facsimiles of P published by Robert¹⁰ with the facsimile of Bibl. Mun. 1, Épernay published by C. Samaran and R. Marichal.¹¹ The upper loop of *g* in the Épernay manuscript is somewhat more open than is the case in P, but otherwise the writing is almost identical in the two documents. Both make use of *i-longa*,¹² and in both words are consistently run together.¹³ Since the Épernay manuscript can, on the basis of information contained in its colophon,¹⁴ be

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xv.

⁹ Edward Kennard Rand, "On the Symbols of Abbreviations for *-tur*," *Speculum*, II (1927), pp. 52-65.

¹⁰ Robert, *op. cit.*, after p. xl.

¹¹ Charles Samaran and Robert Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, Tome V, Planches (Paris, 1965), Pl. II.

¹² For a discussion of the use of *i-longa* in P see Robert, *op. cit.*, p. xiii.

¹³ The two facsimiles of P printed by Robert do not give an accurate picture of the extent to which words are joined in the manuscript. On most pages there is considerably more joining of words than is found in either of the facsimiles.

¹⁴ Samaran and Marichal, *op. cit.*, Tome V, Texte, p. 159.

dated in the interval between 817 and 834, this fits in well with the thesis that P was copied around 820.

Robert's *texte paléographique* retains almost all the distinguishing features of the manuscript itself. The pages correspond exactly to the pages in P with the exception that the misplaced folios have been restored to their correct position. Hence pages 1-48 correspond to ff. 33-56, pages 49-64, to ff. 64-71, and pages 65-78, to ff. 57-63. The line divisions are the same as in the manuscript and abbreviations are consistently indicated. The only exception which I have found is in the title of V, 6.¹⁵ The wording of this title as reported on p. 75 of Robert's text (= P, f. 62^r) is CALUUS ET QUIDAM PILIS DEFECTUS. The final M of QUIDAM, however, is not actually written out in the manuscript, but takes the form of a bar above the preceding A. In some cases Robert seems to have gone to unnecessary lengths to reproduce the characteristics of P. It might be questioned, for instance, whether it is important to note cases in which a ligature is used for final *-nt*. But since Robert has undertaken to designate these cases with a special symbol, it should be noted in the interests of completeness that he has failed to record such ligatures for *possideant* (IV, 5, 15 = Rob., p. 50; P, f. 64^v), *exhibeant* (IV, 7, 24 = Rob., p. 53; P, f. 66^r), and *iubent* (IV, 18, 16 = Rob., p. 59; P, f. 69^r). On the other hand, it might be desirable for future editors of palaeographical editions to use some more effective method of distinguishing between symbols for *per-* and *pro-*. While Robert is quite accurate in making such distinctions, the symbols he uses for the two are so similar to each other that the reader must look closely to tell them apart. This is certainly not true of the symbols used in P. A short horizontal stroke through the base of *p* (as is customary in all Carolingian manuscripts) is used for *per-*, while *pro-* is indicated by a long stroke curved downward to the left from the base of the loop of *p* and ending with a hook extended somewhat to the right. It is impossible to confuse the two symbols in the manuscript.

In his *texte paléographique* Robert prints all headings in capitals, using red ink when this reflects the practice followed in

¹⁵ Throughout this paper Fables are designated by the numbers ascribed to them in the edition of Postgate (above, note 3).

the original. In his notes on the headings at the beginning of the manuscript he indicates that LIB' FABULARUM is in rustic capitals;¹⁶ actually this text is in uncials, as is the next line, FEDRI AUGUSTI LIBERTI LIB FABUL'RU. The following line, AESOPUS AUCTOR QUAM MATERIAM, is listed by Robert in his notes as being in "petites capitales,"¹⁷ but is actually in rustic capitals. No information is provided by Robert as to the script used in the headings of individual Fables. As a matter of fact all of them, with the following few exceptions, are in rustic capitals: uncials are used for the titles of I, 1 (f. 33^r), 14 (ff. 37^r-37^v), 15 (f. 37^v), 17 (f. 38^r), and 28 (f. 41^r). In addition, although the titles of IV, 1 (f. 55^v) and 23 (f. 71^v) are primarily in rustic capitals, Carolingian *e* is used in *et* in the former and *parturiens* in the latter.

The most significant error made by Robert in his interpretation of P consists in his reading *mulcatus* for I, 3, 9 where P actually has *multatus* (f. 34^v). Modern editors all accept *mulcatus*, presumably on the assumption that it represents the consensus of Codex Remensis (= R) and P. But since R's reading cannot be determined with certainty by reason of the fact that the manuscript itself was destroyed by fire in 1774 and since it can now be established that P reads *multatus* instead of *mulcatus*, it would seem that *multatus* should be adopted into the text by future editors. It has behind it the authority of the only surviving manuscript and fits the sense of the passage as well as does *mulcatus*.

There are three instances in which a study of P shows that it is correct where Robert has reported it as being in error. In reporting on *miseriti* (III, 2, 4) Robert states (p. 108) that the word was originally *miserati*. Actually the reading found on f. 48^r was clearly *miseriti* originally. The second *i* has been partially erased. For III, 14, 8 Robert reports the reading of P for *positae* as *posite*. In the manuscript, however, the final *e* of this word (f. 53^v) is clearly *e-caudata*. And for IV, 19, 1

¹⁶ After his *texte paléographique* Robert provides (pp. 79-146) a normalized text of the Fables based on P. In footnotes to this text he discusses some of the readings of the manuscript, particularly where erasures or corrections are involved. It is in such a note on p. 81 that the information here referred to is provided.

¹⁷ Robert, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

Robert indicates that the reading for *tempus* in P is *tepus*. In the manuscript, however, faint traces of a bar over the *e* of this word can be seen (f. 69^v). This shows that the scribe definitely wrote *tempus*.

The following minor errors made by Robert in reporting the text of P are indicated not because they are important in themselves, but for the sake of making the record of P's readings more nearly complete:

In line 2 of the Prologue of the first book *ego* appears in P (f. 33^r) as *e*go*. It is impossible to determine with certainty what letter has been erased, but it appears that the original reading was *ergo*.

In *excepit* (I, 12, 9) the *e* appears in the manuscript (f. 36^v) as *e-caudata*.

In discussing *timore* (II, 4, 16) Robert reports (p. 100) that the word was originally *tumore*. In the manuscript (f. 43^v) the *i* of *timore* is obviously followed by an erasure, but this erasure is much too large to have been occupied merely by the second stroke of *u*. It seems certain that the reading was originally *timmore*. This would be more consistent with *timore* than would *tumore*.

In III, 1, 6 *tales* was originally *teles* (f. 48^r), but this was altered to *tales*, possibly by the corrector.

In III, 10, 7 the *o* of *fabulosa* (f. 51^r) has been written over an erasure. The reading appears originally to have been *fabulusa*.

In III, 17, 8 the *t* of *at* (f. 55^r) was written over an erasure. The original reading appears to have been *aut*.

In discussing *oliva* (III, 17, 9) Robert indicates (p. 118) that the *i* of this word has been inserted by a corrector, but he makes no suggestion as to the identity of the original reading. Actually the earlier reading in P (f. 55^r) was clearly *olava*.

In discussing *pecora* (IV, 5, 23) Robert states (p. 124) that M. Berger de Xivrey has reported the original reading of P at this point as being *peccara*, but it is his contention that the original reading was *pecorra* (with the first *r* expunged). It seems, however, that both were wrong, since the form found in P (f. 64^v) is *pecoara* (with the first *a* expunged).

After *tempestatibus* (IV, 17, 3) there appears in P (f. 68^v) a character, unreported by Robert, which resembles a *u*.

In IV, 20, 25 the second *i* of *circumcidis* has been written over an erasure in P (f. 70^v). The original reading appears to have been *circumcedis*.

In V, 7, 16 *facturus* originally was copied by P (f. 62^v) as *factusus*, but this was changed to *facturus*, apparently by the first hand.

Precibus (V, 7, 18) appears in P (f. 62^v) as *pretibus*.

Finally it should be noted that some ink has been spilled on the lower portion of f. 35^r of P with the result that *ranae* (I, 6, 4) and most of *permotus* (I, 6, 5) have been obliterated.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

ON THE SUPPOSEDLY OTIOSE ἄν AT DEMOSTHENES, 20, 17.

Dem., 20, 17:

καίτοι τῶν ἀπασῶν ἥς ἄν τινος πολιτείας τὸ κομίζεσθαι τοὺς εὐνοὺς τοῖς καθεστῶσιν χάριν ἄν ἐξέλης, οὐ μικρὰν φυλακὴν αὐτῶν ταύτην ἀφῆρηκώς ἔσει.

ἥς ἄν τινος (vel ἡσάντινος) SLYOP ἡστινος ἄν A ἡστινος ἄν οὖν corr. in S ἡστινοσοῦν F, corr. in L, vulg. / ἄν ἐξέλης SLAYO ἄν ἀφέλης F, vulg. (ἄν) ἀφέλης Krüger, "Sprachlehre," 1, 54, 10, 4 (ἄν) ἐξέλης Dindorf, Westermann, Weil, Butcher, Navarre-Orsini

According to the usual understanding of this sentence it is a relative conditional (hypothetical) sentence with ἄν and Subjunctive. This is a very common sentence form, copiously illustrated in all the grammars.¹ The relative pronoun can be ὅστις

¹ Krüger-Pökel, I, 54, 15, 1; Kühner-Gerth, II, 425 ff.; Stahl, 526, 3; Schwyzer, II, 312; Smyth-Messing, 2567; Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, 532. Westermann in his discussion of this passage gives a lucid presentation of the traditional exegesis and the critical measures which this entails. He says: "ἥς ἄν τινος—χάριν ἐξέλης: Die Mss. haben ἄν nicht nur an dieser Stelle, sondern wiederholt vor ἐξέλης. Allein dies zweite ἄν, das doch nur Bedingungspartikel (= ἔάν) sein könnte, ist unstatthaft, da schon ἥς ἄν τινος als hypothetisches Relativ (= ἔάν τινος) zu fassen ist. vgl. Krüger 54, 13, 1. Die älteren Interpreten suchten diese